Application No.: 09/772,320 Docket No.: 418268855US

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20-21, and 27-37 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. Claims 1 and 18 are amended by this response. Claims 7-8, 16-17, 19-21, and 27-37 are cancelled by this response. Claims 77-82 are added by this response. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 9-15, 18, and 77-82 are now pending.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for his consideration during a telephone interview completed on September 27, 2005. During that telephone interview, applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed differences between pending claim 1 and U.S. Patent No. 6,463,461 ("Hanson") and the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection in the last Office Action of July 28, 2005. Further details relating to the discussion are provided below. Should the Examiner require additional details relating to the interview, applicants' representative encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

The last Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1. Applicants have amended claim 1. Applicants believe that this claim now conforms with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The last Office Action rejected claims 1-15, 18-21, 27-33, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,461 ("Hanson"). The last Office Action rejected claims 16-17 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hanson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,480 ("Conmy"). These references were discussed in applicants' response of April 11, 2005.

Independent claim 1 now recites "determining whether the indicated electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message; and when the indicated electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message, performing an accepted the command." Neither Hanson nor Conmy provide a command and take different actions for

Application No.: 09/772,320 Docket No.: 418268855US

the same command depending on whether the message is a collaborative electronic mail message. An advantage to this technique is that a user who is familiar with an electronic mail client program can use the same command to manipulate both collaborative and non-collaborative electronic mail messages.

Independent claim 79 recites "determining whether the electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message; and when the received electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message, modifying the collaborative electronic mail message in accordance with the command and notifying recipients of the modification." Neither Hanson nor Conmy take different actions for the same command depending on whether the message is a collaborative electronic mail message.

Independent claim 81 recites "an electronic mail server program that provides indications of electronic mail messages to the electronic mail client program, receives a command from the electronic mail client program in relation to an electronic mail message, and takes an appropriate action for the received command depending on whether the electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message." Neither Hanson nor Conmy take different actions for the same command depending on whether the message is a collaborative electronic mail message.

Because features recited by the independent claims are neither taught nor suggested by the applied references, these independent claims cannot be rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Because the dependent claims import the limitations from the claims on which they depend, they also cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Application No.: 09/772,320 Docket No.: 418268855US

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6478.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Perkins Cole LL

Date: Oct. 21, 200r

Rajiv P. Sárathy Registration No. 55.592

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 45979 Perkins Coie LLP P.O. Box 1247 Seattle, Washington 98111-1247 (206) 359-8000